



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,731	02/12/2004	Shaibal Roy	ID-495 (80227)	5602
<div>7590 01/23/2008 CHRISTOPHER F. REGAN, ESQUIRE ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST, P.A. P.O. Box 3791 Orlando, FL 32802-3791</div>			<div>EXAMINER KEEFER, MICHAEL E</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT 2154</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE 01/23/2008</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE PAPER</div>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/777,731

Applicant(s)

ROY ET AL.

Examiner

Michael E. Keefer

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Application filed 2/12/2004.

Terminal Disclaimer

2. The terminal disclaimer filed on 12/5/2007 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of 10/777,959 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 12, 18, 24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Poor et al. (US 2002/0183080), hereafter Poor.

Regarding **claims 1, 12, 18, 24 and 28**, Poor discloses:

A communications system comprising:

a plurality of data storage devices, each using at least one of a plurality of operating protocols, at least one data storage device operating using multiple operating protocols; (Fig. 1 severs 30 and 28, the storage devices use multiple operating protocols, not limited to tcp/ip, the internal operating protocol of the

server itself (i.e. the operating system), in addition [0026] indicates that a server configuration file may contain multiple protocols)

a plurality of mobile wireless communications devices for accessing said at least one data storage device and each using at least one of the plurality of operating protocols; and (Fig. 1, wireless devices 10)

a protocol interface device comprising (Fig. 1 server 12)

a front-end proxy module for communicating with said plurality of mobile wireless communications devices using respective operating protocols, and (Fig. 1, server 12 receives information from wireless devices 10, therefore communication devices using respective operating protocols)

a protocol engine module for communicating with said plurality of data storage devices using respective operating protocols and selecting a desired operating protocol for communicating with said at least one data storage device from the multiple operating protocols. (Fig. 1, Server 12, [0028] and Fig. 3, intermediate system determines that the email service uses the pop3 protocol and selects it for use for communication with the server)

Regarding **claims 6-8, 17, 23, 27, and 31**, Poor discloses:

wherein said plurality of data storage devices, said plurality of mobile wireless communications devices, and said protocol interface device process

electronic mail (e-mail) messages. ([0028] discloses retrieving email messages from email mailboxes as requested by a mobile device)

Regarding **claims 4, 14, 20, 26, and 30**, Poor discloses:

wherein said protocol interface device further comprises a memory connected to said protocol engine module for storing per-account information associated with each mobile wireless communications device; and wherein said protocol engine module further selects the desired operating protocol based upon the per-account information for a given wireless communications device. ([0027] discloses per-user(device) account information including desired operating protocols.)

Regarding **claims 5, 15-16, and 21-22**, Poor discloses:

wherein said front-end proxy module and said protocol engine module communicate using a common interface protocol able to represent a desired number or all of protocol-supported elements for a desired operating protocol. (There must be a protocol that supports all of the protocol-supported elements for the desired operating protocol in order for the system of Poor to function. In this case [0028] discloses that a text protocol is used to signal the intermediate server what functionality is desired from the data servers.)

Regarding **claim 10**, Poor discloses:

A WAN connecting the devices to the protocol device. (Fig. 1, wireless network 14)

Regarding **claim 11**, Poor discloses:

A WAN connecting the storage devices to the protocol devices. (Fig. 1, the internet)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-3, 13, 19, 25, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poor as applied to claims 1, 12, 18, 24, and 28 above, and further in view of Natarajan et al. (US 7194544), hereafter Natarajan.

Poor discloses all the limitations of claims 2-3, 13, 19, 25, and 29 except for choosing the protocol by ranking protocols based off of protocol-supported elements.

The general concept of ranking protocols based off of protocol-supported elements is well known in the art as taught by Natarajan. (Col. 2 lines 9-27 discloses ranking protocols by various criteria, including the relative efficiency of protocols, which involves the elements which a protocol supports.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Poor with the general concept of ranking protocols based off of protocol-supported elements as taught by Natarajan in order to provide greater interoperability to mobile devices by allowing them to dynamically select a most efficient protocol.

7. Claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poor as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chen (US 6918041).

Poor discloses all the limitations of claim 9 except for generating an error responsive to at least one non-supported operating protocol.

The general concept of generating an error responsive to at least one non-supported operating protocol is well known in the art as taught by Chen. (Col. 8, lines 20-35)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Poor with the general concept of generating an error responsive to at least one non-supported operating protocol as taught by Chen in order to obtain an alert on the occurrence of a fault condition.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 12/5/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Poor fails to teach on data storage device operating using multiple operating protocols, and does not disclose selecting a desired operating protocol for communicating with a data storage device.

As cited in the rejection of record, the term "operating protocol" given its broadest reasonable interpretation could mean any protocol used in the operation of the data storage, not limited to the various levels of communication protocols that could be used (i.e. physical layer protocols (Ethernet, CDMA, GSM, SONET, etc.), network level protocols (IP, ATM, etc), transport layer protocols (TCP, UDP,

etc), application layer protocols, protocols internal to the device, such as operating system protocols, USB, and/or Firewire. Additionally, operating protocols can be interpreted to be operating rules which the server uses to determine who can access the data that is stored on the server and what privileges they have when accessing the data.).

Given this interpretation of "operating protocol", it is clear that the data storages as cited above in Roy operate using multiple operating protocols.

Additionally, it is clear that the intermediate server makes a decision as far as what operating protocol to use when interacting with the data storage devices.

See at least paragraphs 27-28 of Poor which show the intermediate server choosing a particular protocol to use to communicate with a particular server.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number:
10/777,731
Art Unit: 2154

Page 8

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael E. Keefer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

1/18/2007